

CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Investigator: Hannah Sampson	Team: Squad #9	CCRB Case #: 201800326	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Force	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Discourt.	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S.
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Abuse	<input type="checkbox"/> O.L.	<input type="checkbox"/> Injury
Incident Date(s) Tuesday, 01/16/2018 6:15 AM	Location of Incident: § 87(2)(b)	Precinct: 83	18 Mo. SOL 7/16/2019	EO SOL 7/16/2019	
Date/Time CV Reported Tue, 01/16/2018 10:01 AM	CV Reported At: CCRB	How CV Reported: Phone	Date/Time Received at CCRB Tue, 01/16/2018 10:01 AM		

Complainant/Victim	Type	Home Address

Witness(es)	Home Address

Subject Officer(s)	Shield	TaxID	Command
1. An officer			Unknown
2. POM Leonard Clarke	27183	940013	084 PCT

Witness Officer(s)	Shield No	Tax No	Cmd Name
1. SDS David Cheesewright	01990	913752	INT CIS

Officer(s)	Allegation	Investigator Recommendation
A. An officer	Abuse: Officers entered § 87(2)(b) in Brooklyn.	
B. An officer	Abuse: Officers searched § 87(2)(b) in Brooklyn.	
C. An officer	Force: An officer struck § 87(2)(b) with a police shield.	
D. An officer	Force: An officer used physical force against § 87(2)(b)	
E. An officer	Force: An officer pointed his gun at § 87(2)(b)	
F. An officer	Force: An officer used physical force against § 87(2)(b)	
G. An officer	Force: An officer used physical force against § 87(2)(b)	
H. An officer	Discourtesy: An officer spoke discourteously to § 87(2)(b)	
I. An officer	Abuse: An officer refused to provide his name and/or shield number to § 87(2)(b)	
J. An officer	Discourtesy: An officer spoke discourteously to § 87(2)(b)	
K. POM Leonard Clarke	Abuse: Police Officer Leonard Clarke threatened to arrest individuals.	

Officer(s)	Allegation	Investigator Recommendation
L.POM Leonard Clarke	Abuse: Police Officer Leonard Clarke threatened to notify Administration for Children's Services.	

Case Summary

On January 16, 2018, § 87(2)(b) filed this complaint with the CCRB via telephone on behalf of herself and her husband, § 87(2)(b). There is no video footage from this incident.

On January 16, 2018, § 87(2)(b) provided a phone statement to the Intake Unit and was scheduled to provide a sworn statement at the CCRB on January 19, 2018. On January 18, 2018, a call was placed to § 87(2)(b) to provide her with the CCRB's address. § 87(2)(b) stated that she needed to be in court the following day but wished to keep her CCRB interview scheduled. On January 18, 2018, an email was sent to § 87(2)(b) providing the details of her appointment and requesting that she respond to the email with contact information for all other civilians present. § 87(2)(b) did not respond to the email and failed to appear for her interview on January 19, 2018. On January 22, 2018, a call was placed to § 87(2)(b) and she stated that she missed her appointment because she was in court. § 87(2)(b) also stated that she had contact information for the other individuals present but that she was unable to provide it at the time of the call. § 87(2)(b) was rescheduled for an appearance at the CCRB on January 24, 2018. On January 24, 2018, § 87(2)(b) failed to appear for her second interview. As of April 22, 2018, a search of the DOC for NYC database revealed § 87(2)(b) is not incarcerated. § 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

On January 24, 2018, a LexisNexis search was performed for contact information for § 87(2)(b). As per the results, three phone numbers, three mailing addresses, and one email address were currently associated with § 87(2)(b). A call was placed to the first phone number and a female recipient stated that it was the wrong number and she did not know anyone by the name of § 87(2)(b). Five calls were placed to the two remaining phone numbers between January 26, 2018, and February 14, 2018. No calls connected to a recipient or voice mailbox. Two letters were mailed to each of § 87(2)(b)'s known mailing addresses on January 26, 2018, and February 8, 2018. To date, no letters were returned by the USPS. Two emails were also sent to § 87(2)(b) on January 26, 2018, and February 8, 2018. Both emails were returned to sender. On January 26, 2018, a CLEAR search was performed and one additional phone number was identified. Five calls were placed to this number between January 26, 2018, and February 14, 2018. Each call connected to a beeping tone. A search of CTS was performed on January 30, 2018, which showed § 87(2)(b) was involved in a previous CCRB complaint. The complaint details revealed one additional phone number for § 87(2)(b). Five calls were placed to this phone number between January 30, 2018, and February 20, 2018. Each call connected to a beeping tone. A search of BADS was performed on February 1, 2018, and an additional phone number for § 87(2)(b) was identified. A call was placed to the number on February 8, 2018. § 87(2)(b)'s daughter, § 87(2)(b) answered the call and stated that she did not have a phone number for her father but said she would have § 87(2)(b) contact the CCRB. § 87(2)(b) confirmed that she was not present for this incident. As of April 22, 2018, a search of the DOC for NYC database revealed § 87(2)(b) is not incarcerated. § 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

On February 15, 2018, § 87(2)(b) contacted the CCRB and stated that she received a letter that was intended for § 87(2)(b). § 87(2)(b) stated that she was present for this incident and provided a phone statement. However, § 87(2)(b) did not wish to provide a sworn

statement to the CCRB until receiving a letter from the agency. § 87(2)(b) identified § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b)'s son, § 87(2)(b) as additional victims to FADO allegations. § 87(2)(b) provided a mailing address for § 87(2)(b) but was unable to provide phone numbers for anyone present. On February 15, 2018, a letter was mailed to § 87(2)(b). On March 22, 2018, a call was placed to § 87(2)(b). She stated that she would call back the following day to schedule her interview. On March 28, 2018, a call was placed to § 87(2)(b) and a voice message was left requesting a call back. While leaving the voice message, § 87(2)(b) called the CCRB. A call was immediately returned to § 87(2)(b) and a voice message was left requesting a call back. On April 12, 2018, a call was placed to § 87(2)(b). She stated that she did not wish to become involved in the investigation because she felt that the CCRB would side with the officers' account of the incident. § 87(2)(b) was advised that the CCRB is an independent agency and that case dispositions are determined based solely on the facts of the investigation. However, § 87(2)(b) re-iterated that she did not wish to provide a sworn statement regarding the incident.

On March 2, 2018, a LexisNexis search was performed for contact information for § 87(2)(b). Two phone numbers, two mailing addresses, and two email addresses were identified. Three calls were placed to both phone numbers between March 2, 2018, and March 16, 2018. Each call connected to a beeping tone. Letters were mailed to § 87(2)(b) on March 15, 2018, and emails were sent on March 15, 2018, and March 21, 2018. On March 22, 2018, § 87(2)(b) contacted the CCRB via email and stated that she would call the CCRB. On March 22, 2018, an email was sent to § 87(2)(b) requesting that she call the CCRB as soon as possible to provide a statement. On March 23, 2018, § 87(2)(b) sent an email and left a voice message with the CCRB providing a phone number on which she could be reached. On March 27, 2018, a call was placed to § 87(2)(b). She stated she would like to provide a statement but was unable to do so at the time of the call and requested that she be called back on March 30, 2018. On March 30, 2018, a call was placed to § 87(2)(b) and a voice message was left requesting a call back. On April 3, 2018, a call was placed to § 87(2)(b) and she provided a phone statement. She stated that her son, § 87(2)(b) could be reached through her phone number but that he was not available at the time. § 87(2)(b) was unable to schedule a sworn statement at the time of the call and stated that she would contact the CCRB on April 6, 2018, with her availability. She would also schedule a time at which § 87(2)(b) could provide a statement during the call. § 87(2)(b) did not have a phone number for her father, § 87(2)(b) and said that she would provide him with the CCRB's phone number. Calls were placed to § 87(2)(b) on April 12, 2018, and April 17, 2018, and voice messages were left requesting a call back. A second letter was mailed to § 87(2)(b) on April 5, 2018. To date, no letters have been returned by the USPS and § 87(2)(b) has not contacted the CCRB to schedule her in person statement. As of April 22, 2018, a search of the DOC for NYC database revealed that § 87(2)(b) is not incarcerated. § 87(2)(g)

In light of the above, § 87(2)(b) could not be reached via § 87(2)(b) for a statement. Searches of CLEAR and BADS were performed for contact information for § 87(2)(b) on March 21, 2018. No results were found. A LexisNexis search was performed on April 21, 2018, and no clear matches for § 87(2)(b) were identified. § 87(2)(g)

Squad No.: ___9___

Investigator:	_____	_____	_____
	Signature	Print Title & Name	Date

Squad Leader:	_____	_____	_____
	Signature	Print Title & Name	Date

Reviewer:	_____	_____	_____
	Signature	Print Title & Name	Date